

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Non-elected claim 20 has been canceled.

The specification has been amended to correspond certain parts of an illustrated embodiment to their correct reference numerals.

The amendments to the final paragraph of claim 1 are supported in the original disclosure at, for example, page 8, lines 5-9 (¶ 0055). Claim 12 has been amended to read on the elected group. Rejoinder of claim 1 is respectfully requested. The remaining amendments to the claims have been presented to address the Section 112 rejection and claim objections, and to clarify the invention further.

Drawings

The drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because Figure 6 does not include a reference for the short splined portion.

In response, Applicant has filed herewith a new Figure 6 including a reference numeral 78 for the short splined portion in an embodiment encompassing the selected species. Applicant respectfully submits that the drawing is supported by the original disclosure, including claims 6 and 7, as evidenced by the Examiner's objection.

Accordingly, approval and entry of the new drawing and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to delete the term “its”. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 4, 5, 14-16, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to correct antecedent basis for the terms “rotor” and “combination,” and delete the term “the latter.” Claim 5 has been amended to replace the term “outside” with “outer diameter.” Claims 14 and 18 have been amended to delete the phrase “the set of”. Claim 16 has been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in full compliance with Section 112, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,370,587 to Johnson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As recited in amended claim 1, the claimed combination is directed to a shaft carrying a rotor and front ball bearing, and a pulley having a peripheral working zone adapted to cooperate with a drive belt. The pulley has a splined inner portion which is complementary to and force-fit attached on a splined outer portion of the shaft. As explained in the specification at page 8, lines 5-9 (¶ 0055):

The pulley 30 is thus secured to the shaft 18 against rotation, due to the gripping effect thus produced. The ball race 50 is also fixed against rotation with respect to the shaft 18 because it is force-fitted on the latter. This force-fitting is tighter than the fitting of the outer race 51 within the surface 52.

Johnson does not disclose a force-fit attachment as recited in claim 1. As explained in the first sentence of the abstract of Johnson, Johnson's mechanism for retaining a pulley involves engagement of a plurality of flexible fingers of the pulley into a circumferential groove of the shaft. This is not a force-fit attachment as defined by the present application. The absence of even a single claim limitation is sufficient to negate anticipation.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Johnson does not disclose or teach the invention claimed in claim 1. Applicant further respectfully submits that claims 2-6, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-19, which depend from claim 1 and incorporate the distinguishing features thereof, are patentable over the applied art for the above reasons and the additional reason that the added features of many of the dependent claims are not suggested.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,571,227 to Colanzi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 7 depends from and thereby incorporates all of the distinguishing features of claim 1. As explained above, Johnson does not disclose a force-fitted attachment between a shaft and pulley. The cited disclosures in Colanzi of a smooth cylindrical surface and splined portion do not overcome this deficiency.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 7.

Finally, Applicant notes that claim 12, previously withdrawn but amended above for rejoinder, depends from claim 1 and incorporates the distinguishing features thereof.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account debit Account 50-0548.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew W. Stavish
Registration No. 36,286

Berenato, White & Stavish LLC
6550 Rock Spring Drive, Ste. 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(301)896-0600